

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-19, and 21-24 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, 11, 14 and 21 have been amended. Claims 2, 8, 9, 15 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of subject matter. New Claims 22-24 have been added. Support can be found for new Claims 22-24 at least in Paragraphs [0035] and [0107] of the Published Application. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 14, and 21 are independent.

On Page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to on the grounds that reference characters “171” and “172” have both been used to designate buffered video data. The specification has been amended to recite “buffered video data 171” to correspond to the figures, and thus the objection is believed to have been overcome, and no replacement figures are believed to be required.

On Page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 6 and 11 are objected to as not being in proper Markush format. Applicants’ have herein amended Claims 6 and 11 to remove the Markush format language, and thus the objection is believed to have been overcome.

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-15, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,185,667 A (“Zimmermann”). Claims 2 and 15 have been cancelled, thus rendering rejection of these claims moot. As to the remaining claims, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, one of which is that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, in part, “an image data processor...configured to transform wide angle image data stored in the first input buffer into corrected image data *on a pixel-by-pixel basis*; and an encoder . . . said corrected image data being transmitted from the image data processor to the encoder *upon completion of each pixel transformation and not being stored in a buffer*” (emphasis added). Amended independent Claim 14 similarly recites, in part, “transforming the buffered wide-angle image data into corrected image data *on a pixel-by-pixel basis* [and] transmitting the corrected image data to an encoder *upon completion of each pixel transformation without buffering the corrected image data*” (emphasis added). Claim 21, as amended, also recites, “means for transforming wide angle image data stored...into corrected image data *on a pixel-by-pixel basis*...and means for encoding... said corrected image data being transmitted from the image transformation means to the encoder means *upon completion of each pixel transformation without storing the corrected image data in a buffer*” (emphasis added). The cited Zimmerman reference fails to disclose transforming image data on a pixel-by-pixel basis and transmitting the corrected image data upon completion of each pixel transformation without buffering.

Primarily, Page 4 of the Office Action recognizes that Zimmerman discloses an output buffer for transformed images. Moreover, Zimmerman explicitly states, “[t]he transformed *image* is filtered by a 2-dimensional convolution filter 8 and the output of the filtered *image* is stored in an output image buffer 9” (Col. 3:43-46)(emphasis added). As clearly disclosed, Zimmerman transforms data on an image-by-image (frame) basis, rather than a pixel-by-pixel basis, and the resulting transformed *image* is provided to the buffer and any subsequent encoder,

rather than providing corrected data upon the completion of transforming *each pixel* as claimed by Applicants. The image-based operation is further highlighted in Zimmerman, as the reference states, “[t]his approach provides a means to transform an *image* from the input video buffer *to the output video buffer* exactly,” (Col. 7:62-64)(emphasis added). Applicants’ claimed pixel-by-pixel transformation and transmission advantageously eliminates the need for the inclusion of an output buffer, the absence of which is also expressly claimed, and reduces the latency involved in processing images on a frame-by-frame basis as disclosed in Zimmerman. Reducing latency is very desirable in many applications, such as the monitoring of live video in security systems and the like where a delay in processing or transmitting image information is unacceptable.

Zimmerman thus fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 21 as required for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is unsupported by the art, and a withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

In addition, Claims 4-7, 10-13, and 17-19 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of amended independent Claims 1 and 14, discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann in view of U.S. Patent 5,414,521 (“Ansley”). Claims 3

and 16 are each dependent from one or another of amended independent Claims 1 and 14, discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 8 of the Office Action, Claims 8-9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann in view of Japanese Patent Publication 10-134187 A (House), relying on corresponding U.S. Patent 6,847,392 for translation. Claims 8-9 and 20 have been cancelled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

New Claims 22-24 are each dependent from one or another of amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 21. As discussed above, the cited Zimmerman reference fails to disclose transforming image data on a pixel-by-pixel basis and transmitting the corrected image data upon completion of each pixel transformation without buffering, let alone transforming wide angle image data “if the data for a pixel is required” for an output signal from an encoder, as stated in Claims 22-24. As such, these claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-19, and 21-24 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Of note, Applicant's undersigned representative is registered to practice before the United States Patent & Trademark Office. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.34 and M.P.E.P. § 405, the signature of Applicant's undersigned representative is representation that he is authorized to represent Applicant and the assignee on whose behalf he is acting.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 502104.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 29, 2008

By: **/Alan M. Weisberg/**
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No.: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 70757
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

87288